The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman

D) G G B II V IE - I

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

DIANNE L. KELLEY and KENNETH HANSEN,

No. C07-0475 MJP

Plaintiffs,

PUTATIVE CLASS ACTION

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,

MICROSOFT'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS

Defendant.

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Pursuant to Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, defendant Microsoft Corporation hereby responds to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions as follows:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1. Limitations on Discovery. This case is currently an individual action being brought by two individuals, and the parties have agreed to bifurcate discovery in this case such that discovery related to whether a class should be certified shall occur before any discovery going to the merits of the case will commence. Unless and until the case is certified as a class action (which Microsoft believes it should not be), discovery will be confined to

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

26

27

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 1

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 · 1201 Third Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 · Fax: (206) 757-7700

6 7

9 10

8

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

issues relevant to class certification. Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they purport to seek information that is not relevant to class certification issues.

- 2. **Privilege.** Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they seek information protected from disclosure by any privilege or other protection including. without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, a settlement privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other constitutional, statutory, common law or regulatory protection, immunity or proscription from disclosure. Where information is withheld under claim of privilege, Microsoft will so indicate on a privilege log. Microsoft does not intend the inadvertent production of any privileged or protected information to constitute a waiver of Microsoft's rights to assert any applicable privilege or protection with respect to any such information or any other matter.
- 3. Obligations Beyond Civil Rules. Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they attempt to impose obligations upon Microsoft that are beyond the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 4. **Proportionality.** Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the extent that they require extensive, unreasonable. expensive, and labor-intensive investigation that is out of proportion to, and cannot be justified in light of, the small size of the Plaintiffs' claims and the limited nature of class certification issues, at least unless and until the case is certified as a class action (which Microsoft believes it should not be). See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1)(C).
- 5. No Waiver. By responding to Plaintiffs' particular discovery requests, Microsoft does not waive these General Objections or any specific objection to a particular request. Similarly, by stating a specific objection in response to a particular request. Microsoft does not waive these General Objections. Microsoft expressly reserves the right to challenge the competency, relevancy, materiality or admissibility of, or otherwise object to

12

22

20

26

the introduction into evidence of, any information provided in response to these discovery requests.

- 6. Supplementation. Microsoft's responses to Plaintiffs' discovery requests are based upon present knowledge, information and belief following its diligent search and reasonable inquiry. Discovery and investigation are ongoing. As additional information and documents become available in the course of discovery or otherwise, Microsoft may deem it appropriate to supplement, alter or amend these responses and objections to Plaintiffs' discovery requests and reserves the right to do so. Microsoft does not thereby undertake any obligation to supplement beyond that imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 7. Confidential and Proprietary Information. Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they invade any right to privacy under any applicable state or federal law or constitutional provision and/or seek trade secrets, confidential, business. financial, proprietary, competitive or sensitive commercial information that is entitled to protection under any applicable law including, without limitation, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26. Such information and documents will not be produced absent entry of an appropriate order protecting the confidentiality of the information. Microsoft is prepared to discuss with Plaintiffs' counsel the appropriate scope and terms of an agreed protective order.
- 8. Information Outside Microsoft's Possession, Custody or Control. Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they seek information that is not in Microsoft's possession, custody or control.
- 9. Information Already in Plaintiffs' Possession or Otherwise Available. Microsoft objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they seek information already within Plaintiffs' possession, publicly available or otherwise available to Plaintiffs from other source(s) equally convenient, less burdensome or less expensive.
- 10. For the convenience of the parties and the Court, Microsoft's counsel has electronically scanned Plaintiffs' requests for admissions to create a new document that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

contains both the original requests for admissions and Microsoft's responses and objections to each. Any deviation from the original discovery requests is unintentional.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Microsoft responds to the individual Requests for Admissions as follows:

Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Microsoft "Windows Vista
 Capable" logo.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

2. Microsoft developed the term "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

3. Microsoft designed the "Windows Vista Capable" logo attached as <u>Exhibit A</u>. **RESPONSE**:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 4

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2700 · 1201 Third Avenue Stattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 · Fax: (206) 757-7700

Exhibi

27

request.

4 5

7 8

6

10 11

9

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

Page |

4. "Windows Vista Capable" refers to minimum specification requirements of a personal computer ("PC") that are necessary to properly run Vista Home Basic.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase "necessary to properly run" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the placement of a "Windows Vista Capable" logo on a PC constituted a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to put it there that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for one or more editions of a Windows Vista operating system to install and run. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

5. Microsoft established the minimum specification requirements necessary for a PC to be certified as "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "certified" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that Microsoft established the minimum hardware and other requirements that would permit an OEM to label a PC with the "Windows Vista Capable" logo. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) - 5

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 · 1201 Third Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 · Fax: (286) 757-7700

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 6

6. A "Windows Vista Capable" logo sticker on a PC constituted a certification by Microsoft that the PC to which it was affixed would properly run Vista Home Basic.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "certification" and the phrase "properly run" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

7. <u>Exhibit B</u> is a true and correct copy of the Microsoft "Premium Ready" logo. **RESPONSE:**

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request as stated and admits only that Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the "Premium Ready" designation. By way of further response, a "Premium Ready" designation constituted a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to make it that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for a Windows Vista Premium edition, as described in the applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin, and that the PC qualified for and bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo.

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 2200 · 1201 Third Avenue
Scattle, Washington 98101-3045
{206) 622-3150 · Fax: (206) 737-7700

Exhibit Page D

1
2

4

6

5

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

Exhibi

First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 7

15 Page 13

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs'

Microsoft developed the term "Premium Ready."

RESPONSE:

8.

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

9. Microsoft designed the "Premium Ready" logo attached as <u>Exhibit B</u>.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request as stated. Microsoft admits only that it designed the stylized form of the "Premium Ready" designation attached to Plaintiffs' Requests as Exhibit B.

10. "Premium Ready" refers to minimum specification requirements of a PC that are necessary to properly run Vista Home Premium.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that "necessary to properly run" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that a "Premium Ready" designation constituted a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to make it that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for a Windows Vista Premium edition, as described in the OEM marketing bulletin and the

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 - 1201 Third Avenue Scattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 - Fax: (206) 757-7700 applicable logo license agreement, and that the PC qualified for and bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

11. Microsoft established the minimum specification requirements necessary for a PC to be certified as "Premium Ready."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "certified" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that Microsoft established the minimum hardware and other requirements that would permit an OEM to designate a PC as "Premium Ready." Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

12. A "Premium Ready" logo sticker on a PC constituted a certification by Microsoft that the PC to which it was affixed would properly run Vista Home Premium.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "certification" and the phrase "properly run" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that a "Premium Ready" designation constituted a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to make it that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements

for the Windows Vista Premium editions, as described in the applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin, and that the PC qualified for and bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

13. A PC certified by Microsoft as "Premium Ready" also had affixed to it a "Windows Vista Capable" sticker.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "certified" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that OEMs were authorized to designate a PC as "Premium Ready" if the PC met the minimum hardware and other requirements for a Windows Vista Premium operating system and qualified for and bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

14. The "Windows Vista Capable" sticker and the "Premium Ready" sticker are two separate and distinct stickers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request as stated. Microsoft admits only that the "Windows Vista Capable" logo is something separate and distinct from the "Premium Ready" designation. The "Windows Vista Capable" logo constituted a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to place it there

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 9

ら Page り

21

22

23

24

25

26

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for one or more editions of a Windows Vista operating system to install and run. A PC could be designated as "Premium Ready" if the PC met the minimum hardware and other requirements for a Windows Vista Premium operating system and qualified for and bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo.

15. The "Windows Vista Capable" sticker does not indicate which version of Vista the PC to which it is affixed is capable of running.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits that the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, viewed in isolation and without reference to any other required disclosures that accompanied the PC and were widely available to prospective purchasers, does not indicate which Windows Vista features or editions the PC to which it is affixed is capable of providing. By way of further response, the "Windows Vista Capable" logo was a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to place it there that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for one or more editions of a Windows Vista operating system to install and run. In addition, the applicable logo license agreement required that OEMs include the following statement "in a conspicuous size and place" on product packaging and on any point-of-purchase displays and in-store marketing materials:

Not all Windows VistaTM features are available for use on all Windows Vista Capable PCs. All Windows Vista Capable PCs will run the core experiences of Windows Vista, such as innovations in organizing and finding information, security and

reliability. Some features available in premium editions of Windows Vista—like the new Windows® AeroTM user interface—require advanced or additional hardware. Check www.windowsvista.com/getready for details.

Microsoft, OEMs, resellers, publishers, and others made this and other information about the features of Windows Vista editions and the hardware needed to provide their features widely available to prospective purchasers.

16. The "Windows Vista Capable" sticker does not indicate that the PC to which it is affixed can only properly run Vista Home Basic.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "indicate" and the phrase "properly run" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, the "Windows Vista Capable" logo was a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to place it there that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for one or more editions of a Windows Vista operating system to install and run. Many PCs bearing the "Windows Vista Capable" logo will run the features of Windows Vista Premium editions.

17. Prior to the launch of Vista, Microsoft considered using a logo to be affixed to PCs other than the "Windows Vista Capable" logo that did designate Basic as the version of Vista that was being certified to work with PCs to which the logo would be affixed.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 11

RESPONSE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

18. Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of a logo that Microsoft considered using as a sticker to be affixed to PCs prior to the launch of Vista in order to indicate to consumers that the PCs had been tested to ensure they will work with Windows Vista Home Basic.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

19. Microsoft considered using a logo to be affixed to PCs prior to the launch of Vista that designated Premium as the version of Vista that was being certified to work with PCs to which the logo would be affixed.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase "certified to work with PCs" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

20. Microsoft considered using a logo to be affixed to computers prior to the launch of Vista that designated Business as the version of Vista that was being certified to work with PCs to which the logo would be affixed.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase "certified to work with PCs" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

21. Microsoft considered using a logo to be affixed to computers prior to the launch of Vista that designated Ultimate as the version of Vista that was being certified to work with PCs to which the logo would be affixed.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase "certified to work with PCs" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

22. The "Windows Vista Capable" sticker does not indicate that the PC to which it is affixed cannot properly run Vista Home Premium.

D Page (

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "indicate" and the phrase "necessary to properly run" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request and incorporates by reference its response to Request for Admission No. 15. By way of further response, the "Windows Vista Capable" logo was a contractually permissible statement by the OEM authorized to place it there that the PC met at least the minimum hardware and other requirements for one or more editions of a Windows Vista operating system to install and run. Many PCs bearing the Windows Vista Capable logo provide the features of Windows Vista Premium editions.

23. Microsoft did not require retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with an explanation as to the meaning of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "at the time of sale" and "explanation as to the meaning" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning. Microsoft also objects to the term "retailers" as vague and ambiguous.

For purposes of all its responses to these Requests for Admissions, Microsoft understands the

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 14

Exhibit B Page 20

3

4

5

6

7

9 10

11

1213

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26 27

B Page ユ

term to refer to non-OEM companies (e.g., Best Buy) that sold PCs with a Microsoft operating system pre-installed.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request because it denies that it had the power to require retailers to take actions or not take actions with respect to the "Windows Vista Capable" program. That program refers to and arose out of contractual relationships between Microsoft and OEMs, not retailers. The applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin required the OEMs to provide end users with information about the capabilities of PCs that bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, as set forth above. Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

24. Microsoft did not advise retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with an explanation as to the meaning of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

18

19

22

23

24

25

26

27

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) - 16

25. Microsoft did not require retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with an explanation as to the limitations of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "at the time of sale" and "explanation as to the limitations" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies that it had the power to require retailers to take actions or not take actions with respect to the "Windows Vista Capable" program because that program refers to and arose out of contractual relationships between Microsoft and OEMs, not retailers. The applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin required the OEMs to provide end users with information about the capabilities of PCs that bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, as set forth above. Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

26. Microsoft did not advise retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with an explanation as to the limitations of "Windows Vista Capable".

> Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 · 1201 Third Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 · Fax: (206) 757-7700

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

27. Microsoft did not require retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with written information as to the meaning of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "at the time of sale" and "as to the meaning of" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies that it had the power to require retailers to take actions or not take actions with respect to the "Windows Vista Capable" program because that program refers to and arose out of contractual relationships between Microsoft and OEMs, not retailers. The applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin required the OEMs to provide end users with information about the capabilities of PCs that bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, as set forth above.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 17

1

3

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Exhibit_

Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

28. Microsoft did not advise retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with written information as to the meaning of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

29. Microsoft did not require retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with written information as to the limitations of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "at the time of sale" and "as to the limitations of" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 18

26

12 13

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

First Set of Requests for Admissions

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies that it had the power to require retailers to take actions or not take actions with respect to the "Windows Vista Capable" program because that program refers to and arose out of contractual relationships between Microsoft and OEMs, not retailers. The applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin required the OEMs to provide end users with information about the capabilities of PCs that bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, as set forth above. Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

30. Microsoft did not advise retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to provide consumers, at the time of sale, with written information as to the limitations of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

9

10

11

15

16 17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

31. Microsoft did not require retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers, to display materials for the benefit of consumers that explained the meaning of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase "display materials for the benefit of consumers" and "meaning of" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies that it had the power to require retailers to take actions or not take actions with respect to the "Windows Vista Capable" program because that program refers to and arose out of contractual relationships between Microsoft and OEMs, not retailers. The applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin required the OEMs to provide end users with information about the capabilities of PCs that bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, as set forth above. Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

Microsoft did not advise retailers which sold PCs designated as "Windows 32. Vista Capable" to consumers, to display materials for the benefit of consumers that explained the meaning of "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

33. Microsoft did not require retailers which sold to consumers PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to display materials for the benefit of consumers that explained the limitations of that designation.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase "display materials for the benefit of consumers" and "limitations of" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies that it had the power to require retailers to take actions or not actions with respect to the "Windows Vista Capable" program because that program refers to and arose out of contractual relationships between Microsoft and OEMs, not retailers. The applicable logo license agreement and OEM marketing bulletin required the OEMs to provide end users with information about the capabilities of PCs that bore the "Windows Vista Capable" logo, as set forth above.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 21

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 + 1201 Third Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 + Fax: (206) 757-7760

27

26

B Page 17

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	
2	6

Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

34. Microsoft did not advise retailers which sold to consumers PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to display materials for the benefit of consumers that explained the limitations of that designation.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, Microsoft did develop and make marketing materials available to retailers concerning the "Windows Vista Capable" program, although Microsoft could not require retailers to use those materials.

35. Prior to January 30, 2007, retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers did not provide consumers with an opportunity to compare a PC actually running Vista Home Basic with a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," and after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft can

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 22

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions

(C07-0475 MJP) - 23

neither admit nor deny this request as stated. Microsoft does not know whether, before January 30, 2007, any or some retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers provided consumers with an opportunity to compare a PC actually running Vista Home Basic with a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

36. Prior to at least January 30, 2007, Microsoft did not authorize or permit retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers to provide consumers with an opportunity to compare a PC actually running Vista Home Basic with a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," and after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request as stated. Microsoft did not have the power to "authorize or permit" retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers (or to refuse to authorize or permit such retailers) to provide consumers with an opportunity to compare a PC actually running Vista Home Basic with a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

37. Prior to January 30, 2007, retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers did not provide consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Basic.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," and after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request as stated. Microsoft does not know whether, before January 30, 2007, any or some retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers provided consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Basic.

38. Prior to January 30, 2007, Microsoft did not authorize or permit retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers to provide consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Basic.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," and after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request as stated. Microsoft did not have the power to "authorize or permit" retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers (or to refuse to authorize or permit such retailers) to provide consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Basic.

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

> Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) - 25

Prior to January 30, 2007, retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows 39. Vista Capable" to consumers did provide consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," and after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request as stated. Microsoft does not know whether, before January 30, 2007, any or some retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers provided consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

Prior to January 30, 2007, Microsoft did authorize retailers that sold PCs 40. designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers to provide consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," and after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request as stated. Microsoft did not have the power to "authorize" retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers (or to refuse to authorize such retailers) to provide consumers with an opportunity to observe a PC actually running Vista Home Premium or Vista Ultimate.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions

(C07-0475 MJP) — 26

41. Microsoft did not authorize retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers to modify the "Windows Vista Capable" sticker.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft admits this request.

42. Microsoft prohibited retailers that sold PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable" to consumers from modifying the "Windows Vista Capable" sticker.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, including Microsoft's objection to and definition of the term "retailers," Microsoft denies the request as stated. By way of further response, if retailers or others modified the "Windows Vista Capable" logo without Microsoft's permission, applicable trademark law would have provided Microsoft with remedies.

43. "Windows Vista Capable" stickers were intended by Microsoft to encourage consumers not to delay their purchases of new PCs until the actual release of Vista.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the "Windows Vista Capable" logo was intended in part to encourage consumers not to delay their purchases of new PCs until the release of Windows Vista. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request as stated.

44. The Vista Upgrade Express program was intended by Microsoft to encourage consumers <u>not</u> to delay their purchases of new PCs until the actual release of Vista.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the "Windows Vista Upgrade Express" program was intended in part to encourage consumers not to delay their purchases of new PCs until the release of Windows Vista. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request as stated.

45. "Windows Vista Capable" stickers were intended by Microsoft to maintain consumer demand for new PCs, with Windows XP pre-installed, prior to the actual release of Vista.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that "maintain consumer demand" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the "Windows Vista Capable" logo was intended in part to encourage consumers not to delay

their purchases of new PCs until the release of Windows Vista. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

46. The Vista Upgrade Express program was intended by Microsoft to maintain consumer demand for new PCs, with Windows XP pre-installed, prior to the actual release of Vista.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that "maintain consumer demand" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the "Windows Vista Express Upgrade" program was intended in part to encourage consumers not to delay their purchases of new PCs until the release of Windows Vista. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

47. Microsoft received a financial benefit from the sale of PCs designated as "Windows Vista Capable."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request. By way of further response, Microsoft also received a financial benefit from PCs containing the Windows XP operating system that were not designated as "Windows Vista Capable."

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 28

25

26

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

23

24

2526

27

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 29

48. Since at least January 30, 2007, Microsoft has offered Windows Defender as a free download to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request, although there are significant functionality differences between the version of Windows Defender that is part of Windows Vista and the version that is available as a free download to consumers running Windows XP.

49. Since at least January 30, 2007, Microsoft has offered Windows Firewall as a free download to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

50. Since at least January 30, 2007, Microsoft has offered Instant Search as a free download to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request as stated. Microsoft admits only that an update to the Windows XP search function is

27

available as a free download. This free download is called Windows Desktop Search. It is not called "Instant Search."

51. Since at least January 30, 2007, Microsoft has offered Windows Internet Explorer 7 as a free download to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that a version of Windows Internet Explorer 7 has been available as a free download to Windows XP users since at least January 30, 2007, but that version does not offer all of the features of Internet Explorer 7 when included in Windows Vista. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

52. Since at least January 30, 2007, Microsoft has offered Network and Sharing Center as a free download to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Page 3C

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

53. Since at least January 30, 2007, Instant Search has been available, without charge, to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request as stated. Microsoft admits only that an update to the Windows XP search function has been available, without charge, to Windows XP users. This free download is called Windows Desktop Search. It is not called "Instant Search."

54. Since at least January 30, 2007, Network and Sharing Center has been available, without charge, to consumers running Windows XP.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

55. The End User License Agreement ("EULA") attached as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of the Windows XP operating system EULA ("XP EULA") that applies to plaintiff and every member of the class as defined in the First Amended Complaint ("Class Members").

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) - 31

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 - 1201 Third Avenue Scattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 · Fax: (206) 757-7700

3 4 5

1

2

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

bith Page 37

56. The EULA attached as <u>Exhibit E</u> is a true and correct copy of the Windows XP operating system EULA ("XP Upgrade EULA") that applies to every end user who purchased an upgrade to the Windows Home XP operating system at any time from March 1, 2006 to January 30, 2007.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

57. The EULA attached as Exhibit F is a true and correct copy of the Windows Vista Home Basic operating system EULA ("Vista Basic EULA") that applies to every end user who has purchased a PC with the Windows Vista Home Basic operating system preinstalled.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request. By way of further response, OEMs are permitted to supplement (and many have supplemented) the Windows Vista EULA that Microsoft provides to them with provisions or protections beyond those in the Windows Vista EULA that Microsoft provides to them.

58. The EULA attached as Exhibit G is a true and correct copy of the Windows Vista Home Basic operating system EULA ("Vista Basic Upgrade EULA") that applies to

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 32

27

every end user who has purchased an upgrade to the Windows Vista Home Basic operating system at any time from March 1, 2006 to January 30, 2007.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request as stated. By way of further response, Microsoft released Windows Vista to the general public on January 30, 2007, and admits only that the Vista Basic Upgrade EULA applies to every end user who purchased an upgraded license from another Microsoft operating system to Windows Vista Home Basic on January 30, 2007.

59. Microsoft drafted the XP EULA.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

60. Microsoft drafted the XP Upgrade EULA.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

61. Microsoft drafted the Vista Basic EULA.

RESPONSE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

62. Microsoft drafted the Vista Upgrade EULA.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request because the term "Vista Upgrade EULA" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning. There is no exhibit attached to Plaintiffs' Requests that Plaintiffs have defined as the "Vista Upgrade EULA."

63. The agreement attached hereto as <u>Exhibit H</u> is a true a true and correct copy of the Windows XP license agreement ("OEM License Agreement") between Microsoft and all OEMs who sold PCs with Windows XP pre-installed at any time from March 1, 2006 to January 30, 2007.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

6

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

21

Hozef Clidic

64. Microsoft drafted the OEM License Agreement.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request because, in the context of this request, the phrase "the OEM License Agreement" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, and assuming that "the OEM License Agreement" refers to the document attached to Plaintiffs' Requests as Exhibit H, Microsoft admits this request.

65. Under the terms of any and all OEM license agreements in effect from March 1, 2006 to January 30, 2007, Microsoft required OEMs to make the XP EULA a condition of the Class Members' ability to activate the Windows XP operating system that came preinstalled on their PCs.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request. Microsoft admits only that its licensing agreements with OEMs required the OEMs to distribute the XP EULA if they pre-installed the Windows XP operating system to which the XP EULA attached to Plaintiffs' Requests as Exhibit D pertains.

66. OEMs were not given discretion by Microsoft to make any modifications to the XP EULA.

RESPONSE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request. By way of further response, however, OEMs were permitted to supplement (and many did supplement) the XP EULA with provisions or protections beyond those in the XP EULA.

67. OEMs were prohibited by Microsoft from making any modifications to the XP EULA.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request. By way of further response, however, OEMs were permitted to supplement (and many did supplement) the XP EULA with provisions or protections beyond those in the XP EULA.

68. The XP Upgrade EULA constituted a contract between Microsoft and the end user.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

69. The XP Upgrade EULA contains provisions that Microsoft intended to benefit and/or protect the interests of Microsoft.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request. By way of further response, Microsoft admits that the XP Upgrade EULA also contains provisions that benefit and/or protect the interests of the end user.

70. The XP EULA contains provisions that benefit and/or protect the interests of Microsoft.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request. By way of further response, Microsoft admits that the XP EULA also contains provisions that benefit and/or protect the interests of the OEM and the end user.

71. The provisions of the XP Upgrade EULA that benefit and/or protect the interests of Microsoft are identical to the provisions of the XP EULA that benefit and/or protect the interests of Microsoft.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Brillion B Page 44

72. Microsoft required Gateway to obtain approval from Microsoft for its Windows Vista advertising.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

73. Microsoft required Gateway to obtain approval from Microsoft for its Windows Vista promotional materials.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

74. Microsoft required PC retailers to obtain approval from Microsoft for their Windows Vista advertising.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1.	3
1	4
1.	5
1	6
1	7
1	
19	9
20)
2	
22	
23	
24	1
25	5
26	
27	

75. Microsoft required PC retailers to obtain approval from Microsoft for their Windows Vista promotional materials.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

76. Microsoft monitored the advertising materials of PC retailers in order to assure the accuracy of such materials as related to Vista.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "monitored" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

77. Microsoft monitored the advertising materials of PC retailers in order to assure the accuracy of such materials as related to the "Windows Vista Capable" program.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "monitored" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

78. Microsoft monitored the promotional materials of PC retailers in order to assure the accuracy of such materials as related to Vista.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "monitored" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

79. Microsoft monitored the promotional materials of PC retailers in order to assure the accuracy of such materials as related to the "Windows Vista Capable" program.

RESPONSE:

B Page 46

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the word "monitored" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

80. Microsoft established procedures to minimize the likelihood of errors by PC manufacturers in placing "Windows Vista Capable" stickers on PCs intended for sale to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "established procedures" and "minimize the likelihood of errors" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the applicable logo agreement contained terms intended to minimize the likelihood that a PC manufacturer would place the "Windows Vista Capable" logo on a PC that did not qualify for the logo. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

81. Microsoft established procedures to eliminate the likelihood of errors by PC manufacturers in placing "Windows Vista Capable" stickers on PCs intended for sale to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "established procedures" and "the likelihood of errors" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that the applicable logo agreement contained terms intended to minimize the likelihood that a PC

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 41

manufacturer would place the "Windows Vista Capable" logo on a PC that did not qualify for the logo. Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

82 Microsoft established procedures to minimize the likelihood of errors by PC manufacturers in placing "Premium Ready" stickers on PCs intended for sale to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "established procedures" and "minimize the likelihood of errors" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the applicable logo agreement did not permit PC manufacturers to place "Premium Ready" stickers on PCs.

83. Microsoft established procedures to eliminate the likelihood of errors by PC manufacturers in placing "Premium Ready" stickers on PCs intended for sale to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the phrases "established procedures" and "minimize the likelihood of errors" are vague and ambiguous with respect to their intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the applicable logo agreement did not permit PC manufacturers to place "Premium Ready" stickers on PCs.

84. Prior to Microsoft's public use of the term "Windows Vista Capable," there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft that the use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be misleading to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

85. Prior to Microsoft's public use of the term "Windows Vista Capable," there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft that the use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be confusing to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

86. Prior to Microsoft's public use of the term "Windows Vista Capable," there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft that the use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be misleading to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

87. Prior to Microsoft's public use of the term "Windows Vista Capable," there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft that the use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be confusing to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 44

Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, there had been concern or opinion within

88.

3

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

misleading to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft that use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

89. Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft that use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be confusing to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion within Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 45

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 - 1201 Third Avenue Scattle, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 - Fax: (206) 757-7700 90. Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft that the use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be misleading to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

91. Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft that the use of the word "capable," within the term "Windows Vista Capable," could be confusing to consumers.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects to this request on the grounds that the clause "there had been concern or opinion expressed or otherwise made known to Microsoft" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 46

Windows Vista Starter and Vista Home Basic have Vista features in common.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

RESPONSE:

92.

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that the phrase "Vista features" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification since Windows Vista Starter is not sold in developed countries, including the United States.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request but admits that Windows Vista Starter and Windows Vista Home Basic have some but not all features in common.

93. Windows Vista Starter and Vista Home Basic have more Vista features in common than Vista Home Basic has in common with Vista Home Premium.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that the phrase "Vista features" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning. Without a definition of what Plaintiffs mean by "Vista features" (e.g., whether "Vista features" means features that were never included in, or available for, any previous Windows operating system or whether it includes improvements to features that existed in previous Windows operating systems), it is impossible to respond to this request.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification since Windows Vista Starter is not sold in developed countries, including the United States.

To date, more copies of Vista Home Basic have been licensed by Microsoft 94. through the "Windows Vista Capable" program, than through the combined, post-January 30, 2007 sales of: (i) new PCs with Vista Home Basic pre-installed; (ii) full versions of Vista Home Basic; (iii) upgrade versions of Vista Home Basic; and, (iv) upgrades through the Windows Anytime Upgrade program.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request because, after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft does not have the information requested and it is not readily obtainable.

95. To date, more copies of Vista Home Premium have been licensed by Microsoft through the post-January 30, 2007 sales of new PCs with Vista Home Premium pre-installed, than were licensed by Microsoft through the Windows Vista Capable, Premium Ready, and Express Upgrade programs.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) - 48

26

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 49

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that this request does not seek information that is relevant to class certification.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft can neither admit nor deny this request because, after reasonable inquiry, Microsoft does not have the information requested and it is not readily obtainable.

96. <u>Exhibit I</u> are true and correct copies of the February, 2007 (Premier Issue) and the April/May 2007 (Issue 2) editions of "Windows Vista™ The Official Magazine."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits this request.

97. Future US, Inc., Future pic, or an affiliated or related entity of either, secured rights from Microsoft to publish "Windows Vista™ The Official Magazine."

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Microsoft further objects on the grounds that the phrase "secured rights" is vague and ambiguous with respect to its intended meaning.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft admits only that it entered into a Publication Agreement with Future Publishing Limited ("Future") as of October 13, 2005, in which Microsoft appointed Future to publish an official Windows Vista magazine under the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement. The specific rights and

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 2200 - 1201 Third Avenue Seatte, Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 - Fax: (206) 757-7700 obligations of Microsoft and Future with respect to the official Windows Vista magazine are set forth in the Publication Agreement and Microsoft therefore admits this request to the extent the Publication Agreement sets out the rights Future acquired under that agreement (which it does). Otherwise, Microsoft denies this request.

98. Microsoft has the right to control the content published in "Windows Vista™ The Official Magazine."

RESPONSE:

request.

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this

99. Prior to publication, Microsoft reviewed the content in each issue of "Windows VistaTM The Official Magazine" published to date.

RESPONSE:

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

100. Prior to publication, Microsoft approved the content in each issue of "Windows Vista™ The Official Magazine" published to date.

RESPONSE:

bit<u>B</u> 199556

26

27

Microsoft incorporates each of its General Objections as if fully set forth here.

Subject to and without waiver of its foregoing objections, Microsoft denies this request.

RESPONSES dated this 2nd day of August, 2007

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

Of counsel:

Charles B. Casper Patrick T. Ryan Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads, LLP 123 S. Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19109 (215) 772-1500

Attorneys for Defendant

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 51

dibit B Page 57

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 2, 2007, I caused the foregoing Microsoft's

Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions to be served via hand delivery on the following:

Jeffrey I. Tilden Gordon Tilden Thomas & Cordell LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4000 Seattle, WA 98154

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

William C. Smart Keller Rohrback L.L.P. 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200 Seattle, WA 98101

DATED this 2nd day of August, 2007.

Lúcy M. Collins

Microsoft's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admissions (C07-0475 MJP) — 52

B Page 58